arXiv:hep-th/9608054v1 9 Aug 1996

TU-508
August 9, 1996

Exact and microscopic one-instanton calculations in $N = 2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories

Katsushi Ito*

Institute of Physics, University of Tsukuba
Ibaraki 305, Japan

and

Naoki Sasakura†

Department of Physics, Tohoku University
Sendai 980-77, Japan

Abstract

We study the low-energy effective theory in $N = 2$ super Yang-Mills theories by microscopic and exact approaches. We calculate the one-instanton correction to the prepotential for any simple Lie group from the microscopic approach. We also study the Picard-Fuchs equations and their solutions in the semi-classical regime for classical gauge groups with rank $r \leq 3$. We find that for gauge groups $G = A_r$, B_r, C_r ($r \leq 3$) the microscopic results agree with those from the exact solutions.

---

*E-mail: ito@het.ph.tsukuba.ac.jp
†E-mail: sasakura@tuhep.phys.tohoku.ac.jp

1 Introduction

The low-energy effective theory of $N = 2$ supersymmetric gauge theory in the Coulomb phase is determined by a single holomorphic function, called the prepotential [1, 2]. Using holomorphy and duality, Seiberg and Witten [3, 4] have shown that the prepotential for the gauge group $G = SU(2)$ is completely determined by studying its singularities at strong coupling, where massless monopole or dyon appears. The quantum moduli space of the low-energy effective theory is characterized by a family of elliptic curves, whose period becomes the effective coupling of the theory. Examining these elliptic curves, one may calculate the non-perturbative effects both in weak and strong coupling regions. In particular, the exact solutions in the weak coupling regime leads to the non-perturbative instanton correction to the effective couplings, while such a multi-instanton calculation is difficult and quite cumbersome in the microscopic theory. From the viewpoint of the microscopic theory, the exact result provides a non-trivial and quantitative test to the method of instanton calculations. On the other hand, the microscopic instanton calculation provides a non-trivial check of the assumption of existence of massless monopole or dyon in the strong coupling region, beyond the one-loop effect.

The microscopic instanton calculation in supersymmetric gauge theories [5]-[10] has some good features. Firstly it is free from infrared divergences [9, 10]. Therefore one may calculate its effect from the first principle. Secondly the non-zero modes of the boson and fermion fields cancel with each other in the one-loop determinant [11], and hence the problem reduces to the integration over finite number of zero-modes. Finally, the holomorphic property of the supersymmetric gauge theory [10, 12, 13] constrains the superpotential so severely that the lowest order calculation is enough to obtain a full order result. In supersymmetric gauge theories, the above features will make it possible to obtain correct instanton contributions by performing microscopic instanton calculations in the lowest order of gauge coupling constant $g \ll 1$, where such a semi-classical approximation would be reliable. Thus one may compare the exact results with the microscopic instanton calculations.

The microscopic instanton calculations have been investigated in the case of $N = 2$ $SU(2)$ [14, 15] and $SU(N_c)$ [16] supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories (SYMs) at the one-instanton level, in the $SU(2)$ SYM [17, 18, 19] and supersymmetric QCD [20, 21, 22] at the two-instanton level, and in the $SU(2)$ SYM in the multi-instanton level [19]. The microscopic instanton results have been consistent with the exact ones so far except $SU(2)$ SQCDs with $N_f = 3$ [21] and $N_f = 4$ [22], where some discrepancies have been reported. But these discrepancies seem to come from the delicate differences between the observables of the exact and the microscopic instanton calculations, and their results do not seem to contradict with the assumptions made by Seiberg and Witten.

In the previous paper [16], we performed the microscopic one-instanton calculation in $N = 2$ $SU(N_c)$ SYM and obtained the agreement between the exact and the microscopic one-instanton results for the $SU(3)$ SYM case. In this paper we study the one-instanton correction to the prepotential of $N = 2$ SYM with arbitrary gauge groups from both the microscopic and the exact calculations.

The exact result for $G = SU(2)$ has been generalized to other gauge groups and SQCDs by introducing matter hypermultiplets [23]-[33]. For the computation of the prepotential, one needs to evaluate the contour integrals of a meromorphic differential over a hyperelliptic curve [3, 4] in the weak coupling region. An efficient approach to study this problem is to use the Picard-Fuchs differential equations and solve them near their singularities. The Picard-Fuchs equations have been obtained for $SU(2)$ [34] and $SU(3)$ SYM [35] and $SU(2)$ SQCDs [36, 37, 38]. In the present work, we shall study the Picard-Fuchs equations for classical gauge groups with rank $r \leq 4$ and examine their solutions in the case of $G = BC_2, A_3, B_3$ and C_3.

One of the technical difficulties in the microscopic one-instanton calculation for general gauge groups is the group integration over the instanton configuration in the color space. If the instanton calculation is done in the background of vanishing scalar vacuum expectation values [9, 10], the result of this integration turns out to be a numerical factor coming from gauge volume [39]. On the other hand, an $N = 2$ SYM theory in the Coulomb phase has non-vanishing scalar vacuum expectation values, and the result of the group integration shows non-trivial dependence on them. Although the group integration in the background of non-vanishing scalar vacuum expectation values was performed explicitly in $N = 1$ $SU(N_c)$ SQCD with $N_c - 1$ fundamental flavors [40, 41], it looks quite formidable in general. In our previous work [16], we improve this technical difficulty by observing that the result of the group integration should be a holomorphic function while the integrand is a function of holomorphic and anti-holomorphic variables. We shall generalize this approach to the other gauge theories.

This paper is organized as follows; In section 2, we will perform the microscopic one-instanton calculation and will obtain the one-instanton correction to the prepotential in the $N = 2$ SYM theory with any simple Lie group. In section 3, we will obtain the Picard-Fuchs equations for the exact solutions of $N = 2$ SYM with some classical gauge groups and will calculate the one-instanton contributions to the prepotentials by solving them. In section 4, we will discuss the relations between the scale parameters in the exact solutions and the dynamical scales in the microscopic theories, and will compare the one-instanton corrections of the prepotential. In Appendix, we will give the conventions on the Cartan-Weyl basis and the list of the Dynkin indices.

2 Microscopic one-instanton calculation

In this section, we will perform the microscopic one-instanton calculation in the background of the non-vanishing scalar expectation values in the lowest order of the gauge coupling constant. In this case, one needs to use, for example, the constraint instanton method [42] to perform an instanton calculation in a theory without a scale invariance. But, since the lowest order result will be enough to obtain a reliable full order result in a supersymmetric gauge theory [10, 12, 13], we do not need to worry about the higher order corrections coming from the constraint added to the action [5, 6]. We will calculate a four-fermi correlation function of massless fermions in the microscopic theory [1, 5, 6] in the one-instanton background. Then we will obtain the one-instanton correction to the prepotential.

2.1 One-instanton configuration and integration measure in $N = 2$ SYM theory

We firstly discuss the zero-modes and the integration measure of the one-instanton configuration in the case of $N = 2$ SYM theory with a general simple Lie group G.

The $N = 2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory with a simple gauge group G contains an $N=1$ chiral multiplet $\phi=(A,\psi)$ with the adjoint representation as well as an $N=1$ vector multiplet $W_\alpha=(v_\mu,\lambda)$. The Lagrangian is[1]

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= 2\int d^4\theta \langle \phi^\dagger e^{-2gV}\phi e^{2gV}\rangle_{\rm g} + \frac{1}{2g^2}\left(\int d^2\theta \langle W^\alpha W_\alpha\rangle_{\rm g} + \text{h.c.}\right), \\
W_\alpha &= -\frac{1}{8}\bar{D}^2 e^{-2gV} D_\alpha e^{2gV},
\end{aligned}
\tag{1}
$$

where g is the gauge coupling constant, and $\langle\cdot\rangle_{\rm g}$ denotes the trace in the adjoint representation normalized as $\langle\cdot\rangle_{\rm g} \equiv \frac{1}{k_D}{\rm Tr}_{adj}(\cdot)$ for convenience. Here k_D denotes the Dynkin index of the adjoint representation of g, the Lie algebra of G (see Appendix). We will examine this Lagrangian in terms of component fields in the Wess-Zumino gauge. The euclidean Lagrangian of (1) is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= \frac{1}{2}\langle G_{\mu\nu}G_{\mu\nu}\rangle_{\rm g} + 2\langle (D_\mu A)^\dagger D_\mu A\rangle_{\rm g} + g^2\langle [A,A^\dagger]^2\rangle_{\rm g} + 2i\langle \Psi^\dagger M_F \Psi\rangle_{\rm g}, \\
\Psi &= \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \\ \psi^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \Psi^\dagger = (\lambda^\dagger, \psi), \\
M_F &= \begin{pmatrix} -i\tau^-_\mu D_\mu & \sqrt{2}gA \\ -\sqrt{2}gA^\dagger & i\tau^+_\mu D_\mu \end{pmatrix}, \\
\tau^\pm_\mu &= (\sigma, \mp i), \\
D_\mu &\equiv \partial_\mu - igv_\mu,
\end{aligned}
\tag{2}
$$

where σ denotes the Pauli matrix.

Let us study the one-instanton solution of the gauge field. In the lowest order of g, one can neglect the source terms from the other fields, and the classical equation of motion of the gauge field $D_\mu G_{\mu\nu}=0$ has the instanton solution [44, 45]. In the singular gauge, the instanton solution with unit topological charge located at the origin is given by [46]

$$
v_\mu = \frac{2}{g}\frac{\rho^2 \bar{\eta}_{a\mu\nu}x_\nu}{x^2(x^2+\rho^2)}\Omega J^a \Omega^\dagger,
\tag{3}
$$

where $\bar{\eta}_{a\mu\nu}$ and ρ are the 't Hooft symbol [47] and the instanton size, respectively. The Ω is an element of the Lie group G, and the integration over it is necessary to ensure the gauge invariance of the instanton calculation. The J^a are the three generators of the $SU(2)$ obtained by embedding an $SU(2)$ into the Lie group G which minimizes the classical value of the gauge kinetic term in the action. This is equivalent to taking the three generators satisfying $[J^a, J^b] = i\varepsilon^{abc}J^c$ with a minimal value of $\langle J^a J^a\rangle_{\mathrm{g}}$. Assuming J^3 is an element of the Cartan subalgebra H of the Lie algebra, it is obtained [48] that

---

[1] We follow the conventions given in the text book by Wess and Bagger [43].

$$\begin{aligned} J^3 &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{r}\alpha^l_i H_i, \\ J^\pm &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(J^1 \pm iJ^2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}E_{\pm\alpha^l}, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where α^l denotes one of the longest roots. More about our conventions on the Cartan-Weyl basis are given in Appendix A. The norm of the generators takes the minimal value $\langle J^a J^a\rangle_{\mathrm{g}} = \frac{1}{2}$, and the classical value of the gauge kinetic term is given by

$$S_g = \frac{8\pi^2}{g^2}. \tag{5}$$

Since $[J_3, E_\alpha] = \frac{1}{2}(\alpha^l, \alpha)E_\alpha$ and (α^l, α) takes only the integral values $0, \pm1, \pm2$, all the generators in the Lie algebra g are classified into the parts which have the spin $0, \frac{1}{2}, 1$ representations of the embedded $SU(2)$ [48]. The spin 1 generators are those of the embedded $SU(2)$, and the number d of the doublet pairs (spin $\frac{1}{2}$) is related to the Dynkin index by

$$d = k_D - 4, \tag{6}$$

which can be derived by evaluating $\langle J^3 J^3\rangle_{\mathrm{g}}$ in two ways [48]. We will write those doublet pairs more explicitly. Define

$$\begin{aligned} E^{(\alpha^1)} &= (E_{\alpha^1}, E_{\alpha^1-\alpha^l}), \\ E^{(-\alpha^1)} &= (E_{-\alpha^1+\alpha^l}, -E_{-\alpha^1}) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

for an α^1 satisfying $(\alpha^l, \alpha^1) = 1$. With appropriate normalizations of E_α's , the $SU(2)$ generators are represented as $[J_i, E^{(\pm\alpha^1)}] = E^{(\pm\alpha^1)}\frac{1}{2}\sigma_i$, where σ_i is the Pauli matrix. We denote the set of α^1's labeling all the two doublet pairs (7) by $\Delta^1(\alpha^l)$, which has $d/2 = (k_D - 4)/2$ elements in total.

In the lowest order of g, the classical equation of motion of λ is given by $\tau^-_\mu D^\mu\lambda = 0$, and the same for ψ. The index theorem [49] applied for this case tells that this equation has k_D solutions. These fermion zero-modes in the one-instanton background can be given explicitly by using the generators with spin $\frac{1}{2}$ and 1 of the embedded $SU(2)$ as follows (for $\Omega = 1$):

$$\begin{aligned} {\lambda^{SS}}_{\alpha} &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}\rho^2}{\pi} \frac{x_\mu x_\nu \eta_{c\nu\lambda} \bar{\eta}_{d\mu\lambda} (\sigma_c \xi^{SS})_\alpha}{x^2 (x^2+\rho^2)^2} J^d, \\ {\lambda^{SC}}_{\alpha} &= \frac{\rho}{\pi} \frac{x_\nu \bar{\eta}_{c\nu\lambda} (\tau^+_\lambda \xi^{SC})_\alpha}{(x^2+\rho^2)^2} J^c, \\ {\lambda^{(\pm\alpha^1)}}_{\alpha} &= \frac{\rho i}{\sqrt{2}\pi} \frac{x_\mu (E^{(\pm\alpha^1)} \tau^-_\mu \varepsilon)_\alpha}{(x^2+\rho^2)^{3/2} \sqrt{x^2}} \xi^{(\pm\alpha^1)}, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where ε denotes a 2 by 2 anti-symmetric tensor with $\varepsilon^{12} = 1$, and we have used ξ to label the gaugino zero-modes. The λ^{SS} and λ^{SC} are called the supersymmetric and the superconformal zero-modes, respectively, which can be obtained by applying the supersymmetry and the superconformal transformations to the gauge field (3), respectively. The label α^1 runs through $\Delta^1(\alpha^l)$, and hence there are $2+2+d = k_D$ zero-modes in (8).

To define the integration measure, we will use the following norm:

$$\parallel \phi(x) \parallel^2 = \int d^4x 2 \langle \phi(x)^\dagger \phi(x) \rangle_{\mathrm{g}}, \tag{9}$$

where the field $\phi(x)$ takes values in the Lie algebra g. The integration measure on the group space is defined through the following norm for an element s in the Lie algebra g:

$$\parallel s \parallel^2_{\mathrm{g}} = 2\langle s^\dagger s \rangle_{\mathrm{g}}. \tag{10}$$

The bosonic zero-modes are the size ρ and the location x_0 of the instanton as well as the location of the embedded $SU(2)$ in the Lie group G. The change of the instanton configuration under the infinitesimal shifts of those zero-modes were calculated explicitly, and the norms are given by [39]

$$\begin{aligned} \parallel A_\mu^{(\mathrm{trans.})} \parallel &= \frac{2\sqrt{2}\pi}{g}, \\ \parallel A_\mu^{(\mathrm{dilat.})} \parallel &= \frac{4\pi}{g}, \\ \parallel A_\mu^{(\mathrm{trip.})} \parallel &= \frac{2\pi\rho}{g}, \\ \parallel A_\mu^{(\mathrm{doub.})} \parallel &= \frac{\sqrt{2}\pi\rho}{g}, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where the trip. and doub. denote the infinitesimal shifts generated by the triplet and doublet generators in g, respectively. Since the number of the doublet zero-modes is related to the Dynkin index by (6), the bosonic integration measure is given by [39, 10, 40]

$$2^7 \pi^{k_D} \mu^{2k_D} g^{-2k_D} \int_0^\infty d\rho \rho^{2k_D-5} \int d^4 x_0 \int_{G/G_s} d\Omega, \tag{12}$$

where we have introduced the Pauli-Villas regulator μ, and G_s is the stability group of the instanton $G_s = \{g | J^a = g J^a g^\dagger, g \in G\}$. Since we are interested only in a correlation function invariant under the space rotational transformation, this symmetry induces the invariance of the integrand under the color rotational symmetry generated by the embedded $SU(2)$ [50]. The integration over it results in the gauge volume $\mathrm{Vol}(SU(2)_{adj}) = 2^3\pi^2$, where we have used the definition of the norm (10) in the estimation of the gauge volume.

The fermionic zero-modes (8) are normalized to unity under the norm (9). Hence the fermionic measure is given by [47, 7, 10]

$$\mu^{-k_D} \int d^2\xi^{SS} d^2\zeta^{SS} d^2\xi^{SC} d^2\zeta^{SC} \prod_{\alpha^1 \in \Delta^1(\alpha^l)} d\xi^{(\alpha^1)} d\zeta^{(\alpha^1)} d\xi^{(-\alpha^1)} d\zeta^{(-\alpha^1)}, \tag{13}$$

where we have introduced ζ to label the ψ zero-modes.

Gathering (5), (12) and (13), the integration measure over the zero-modes of the instanton configuration is given by

$$2^{10} \pi^{k_D+2} \Lambda_d^{k_D} g^{-2k_D} \int d^4 x_0 \int_0^\infty d\rho \rho^{2k_D-5} \int_{G/SU(2)\times G_s} d\Omega \int d^{2N_c}\xi d^{2N_c}\zeta, \tag{14}$$

where we have used $\int d^{2N_c}\xi d^{2N_c}\zeta$ to denote the Berezin integration part in (13) for simplicity, and the dynamical scale is defined by $\Lambda_d^{k_D} = \mu^{k_D} \exp\left(-\frac{8\pi^2}{g^2}\right)$.

2.2 Instanton calculation with scalar vacuum expectation values

Now we calculate the four fermion correlation function

$$\langle \psi_0^\dagger(x_1)_{\dot\alpha} \psi_0^\dagger(x_2)^{\dot\alpha} \lambda_0^\dagger(x_3)_{\dot\alpha'} \lambda_0^\dagger(x_4)^{\dot\alpha'} \rangle \tag{15}$$

of the classically massless fermion fields in the microscopic theory [1, 5, 6]: $\psi_0^\dagger(x) \equiv \langle\langle A\rangle \psi^\dagger(x)\rangle_{\mathrm{g}}$, $\lambda_0^\dagger(x) \equiv \langle\langle A\rangle \lambda^\dagger(x)\rangle_{\mathrm{g}}$. We will need to evaluate the Yukawa terms to cancel the fermionic zero-modes in the instanton measure (14), and hence the scalar vacuum expectation values will appear in the calculation.

The potential term $\langle [A, A^\dagger]^2 \rangle_{\mathrm{g}}$ in (2) has the classical flat directions

$$\begin{aligned} A_0 &= \sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i H_i, \\ A_0^\dagger &= \sum_{i=1}^{r} \bar{a}_i H_i, \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where H_i are the generators in the Cartan subalgebra, and we take a_i and $\bar{a}_i$ as independent variables to effectively use the holomorphy argument [10, 12, 13] in the instanton calculations [16]. For generic $a_i, \bar{a}_i$'s, the non-abelian gauge symmetry is completely broken to the Cartan subalgebra $U(1)^r$ spanned by the H_i, and the system is in the Coulomb phase.

As for the color space, the instanton resides in the $SU(2)$ subgroup minimally embedded to the gauge group G [48] as was discussed in the previous subsection. The integration over the embedding is needed to ensure the gauge invariance of the instanton calculation. As can be shown by the global gauge transformation, this is equivalent to the integration over the orientation of the scalar vacuum expectation values in the color space [6, 40, 41]. Thus the group integration $\int d\Omega$ in (14) can be done by rotating the scalar expectation values,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle A \rangle &= \Omega^\dagger A_0 \Omega, \\ \langle A^\dagger \rangle &= \Omega^\dagger A_0^\dagger \Omega, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

while the embedding of $SU(2)$ itself is held fixed (The Ω in (3) is neglected.).

In the lowest order of g, the equation of motion of the scalar field is given by $D_\mu^2 A(x) = 0$. The solution of this equation with the asymptotic value (17) is given by

$$A(x) = \frac{x^2}{x^2+\rho^2} \langle A \rangle^t + \sqrt{\frac{x^2}{x^2+\rho^2}} \langle A \rangle^d + \langle A \rangle^s, \tag{18}$$

where $\langle A \rangle^t, \langle A \rangle^d, \langle A \rangle^s$ denote the triplet, doublet and singlet part of the $\langle A \rangle$ concerning the embedded $SU(2)$. Substituting this solution to the scalar kinetic term, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} S_m &= 8\pi^2 \rho^2 f(\langle A \rangle, \langle A^\dagger \rangle), \\ f(\langle A \rangle, \langle A^\dagger \rangle) &= \left\langle \langle A^\dagger \rangle^t \langle A \rangle^t + \frac{1}{2} \langle A^\dagger \rangle^d \langle A \rangle^d \right\rangle_{\mathrm{g}}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

First we will consider the integration over the fermionic zero-modes. In the lowest order of g, it turns out that the four supersymmetric zero-modes in the integration measure cancel with those appearing in the massless fermion fields in (15) [1, 5, 6]. This is estimated by solving the equations of motion of those fields:

$$\begin{aligned} i\tau^{+\,\mu} D_\mu \psi^\dagger(x) - \sqrt{2} g [A^\dagger(x), \lambda^{SS}(x)] &= 0, \\ i\tau^{+\,\mu} D_\mu \lambda^\dagger(x) + \sqrt{2} g [A^\dagger(x), \psi^{SS}(x)] &= 0, \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where we have substituted the supersymmetric fermionic zero-modes (8) into the source terms. These equations can be solved as

$$\begin{aligned} \psi^\dagger(x)^{\dot\alpha} &= \frac{g}{4\pi i} (\tau^{-\,\mu} \xi^{SS})^{\dot\alpha} D_\mu A^\dagger(x), \\ \lambda^\dagger(x)^{\dot\alpha} &= -\frac{g}{4\pi i} (\tau^{-\,\mu} \zeta^{SS})^{\dot\alpha} D_\mu A^\dagger(x) \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

by performing the supersymmetry transformation on the field $A^\dagger(x)$ [5, 6]. Since we are interested in the effective four-fermi vertex induced by an instanton, taking $x_i - x_0 \gg \rho$, we obtain

$$\psi_0^\dagger(x_1)_{\dot\alpha} \psi_0^\dagger(x_2)^{\dot\alpha} \lambda_0^\dagger(x_3)_{\dot\alpha'} \lambda_0^\dagger(x_4)^{\dot\alpha'} \sim (\pi g \rho^2 f)^4 \left(\frac{1}{2}\xi_{SS}^2\right) \left(\frac{1}{2}\zeta_{SS}^2\right) S_F^4, \tag{22}$$

where we have denoted the product of the fermion propagators as $S_F^4 \equiv S_{F\dot\alpha}{}^{\beta}(x_1 - x_0) S_F{}^{\dot\alpha}{}_{\beta}(x_2 - x_0) S_{F\dot\alpha'}{}^{\beta'}(x_3 - x_0) S_F{}^{\dot\alpha'}{}_{\beta'}(x_4 - x_0)$ for simplicity.

The remaining fermion zero-modes appear in the Yukawa term $2\sqrt{2} g i \langle \psi(x) [A^\dagger(x), \lambda(x)] \rangle_{\mathrm{g}}$. Substituting the scalar field solution (18) and the fermionic zero-modes (8) into it induces a bilinear term between $(\xi^{SC}, \xi^{(\pm\alpha^1)})$ and $(\zeta^{SC}, \zeta^{(\pm\alpha^1)})$ with a matrix $M(\langle A^\dagger \rangle)$ depending only on $\langle A^\dagger \rangle$.

Hence, after the integration over the fermionic zero-modes and the instanton size ρ, we obtain

$$\langle \psi_0^\dagger \psi_0^\dagger \lambda_0^\dagger \lambda_0^\dagger \rangle = -\frac{\Lambda_d^{k_D} \Gamma(k_D + 2)}{g^{2k_D - 4} 2^{3k_D - 3} \pi^{k_D - 2}} \int_{G/SU(2)\times G_s} d\Omega \frac{\det M(\langle A^\dagger \rangle)}{f(\langle A \rangle, \langle A^\dagger \rangle)^{k_D - 2}} \int d^4 x_0 S_F^4. \tag{23}$$

2.3 Group integration

As will be discussed in the following subsection, the four fermi correlation function must be a holomorphic function of A_0 and must be independent of the anti-holomorphic variable $A_0^\dagger$. Hence, taking the $A_0^\dagger \to \infty$ limit, the matter action (19) will suppress the contributions other than the cases

$$\rho \sim 0 \ \text{ or } \ \langle A\rangle^t, \langle A\rangle^d \sim 0. \tag{24}$$

The former condition was previously discussed in the explicit supersymmetric instanton calculation in the $N = 1$ $SU(2)$ SQCD [8]. The fact that the contributions come only from the restricted region (24) suggests that the group integration remaining in (23) is simple especially in supersymmetric gauge theories. In this subsection, we will perform the group integration

$$\int_{G/SU(2)\times G_s} d\Omega \frac{\det M(\langle A^\dagger\rangle)}{f(\langle A\rangle, \langle A^\dagger\rangle)^{k_D-2}} \tag{25}$$

by generalizing the method we took in our previous paper for the $SU(N_c)$ case [16]. Since the result should be a holomorphic function of A_0, we will obtain it by estimating its poles.

The poles will appear if A_0 is such that $f = 0$ at some Ω . The condition $f = 0$ will be understood as the holomorphic condition $\langle A\rangle^t = \langle A\rangle^d = 0$. This is equivalent to

$$[\Omega J^a \Omega^\dagger, A_0] = 0, \tag{26}$$

where J^a are the generators of the embedded $SU(2)$. For general Ω, the condition (26) will give two conditions of a_i's, and will not be related to the poles. Thus we assume one of the $J^{a\prime} = \Omega' J^a \Omega'^\dagger$ is in the Cartan subalgebra H, say $J^{3\prime} \in H$, so that one of the conditions is trivially satisfied. Repeating the discussions in section 2.1, $J^{i\prime}$ are given as in (4). Thus the condition (26) becomes

$$(\alpha^l, a) = 0, \tag{27}$$

where α^l is one of the longest positive roots.

To estimate the order and the residue of the pole, we shift the condition (27) by an infinitesimally small parameter: $(\alpha^l, a) = \epsilon$. Since $f = O(\epsilon)$ for $\Omega = \Omega'$, it turns out that only the following small fluctuation of Ω is needed in the estimation of the pole:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &= \exp(-i\sqrt{\epsilon}\delta g)\Omega', \\ \delta g &= \sum_{\alpha^1 \in \Delta^1(\alpha^l)} (x^{\alpha^1} E_{\alpha^1} + x^{\alpha^1 *} E_{-\alpha^1} + y^{\alpha^1} E_{\alpha^1-\alpha^l} + y^{\alpha^1 *} E_{-\alpha^1+\alpha^l}). \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

In fact, under this small fluctuation, f remains $O(\epsilon)$:

$$f(\langle A\rangle, \langle A^\dagger\rangle) = \frac{\epsilon}{2}(\bar{a}, \alpha^l) + \sum_{\alpha^1\in\Delta^1(\alpha^l)} \epsilon(a, \alpha^1)(\bar{a}_s, \alpha^1)\left(|x^{\alpha^1}|^2 + |y^{\alpha^1}|^2\right) + o(\epsilon). \tag{29}$$

On the other hand, the leading term of $\det M$ is $O(1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} (\text{Yukawa}) &= \sqrt{2}gi\left(\frac{1}{2}(\alpha^l, \bar{a})\xi_{SC}\varepsilon\sigma^3\zeta_{SC} - \sum_{\alpha^1\in\Delta^1(\alpha^l)}(\alpha^1, \bar{a}_s)(\xi^{\alpha^1}\zeta^{-\alpha^1} + \xi^{-\alpha^1}\zeta^{\alpha^1})\right) + o(1), \\ \det M &= 2^{k_D/2-3}g^{k_D-2}(\alpha^l, \bar{a})^2 \prod_{\alpha^1\in\Delta^1(\alpha^l)}(\alpha^1, \bar{a}_s)^2 + o(1). \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Here $\bar{a}_s$ denotes the singlet part of $\bar{a}$: $\bar{a}_s \equiv \bar{a} - \frac{1}{2}\alpha^l(\bar{a}, \alpha^l)$.

The integration measure of the group integration is defined through the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathrm{g}}$ in (10). Since $\| \sqrt{\epsilon}\delta g \|_{\mathrm{g}}^2 = 4\epsilon\sum_{\alpha^1\in\Delta^1(\alpha^l)}(|x^{\alpha^1}|^2 + |y^{\alpha^1}|^2)$, the integration measure is estimated as

$$d\Omega \sim 2^{2(k_D-4)}\epsilon^{k_D-4} \prod_{\alpha^1\in\Delta^1(\alpha^l)} dx_1^{\alpha^1}dx_2^{\alpha^1}dy_1^{\alpha^1}dy_2^{\alpha^1} \tag{31}$$

in the lowest order of ϵ, where $x^{\alpha^1} = x_1^{\alpha^1} + ix_2^{\alpha^1}$ and $y^{\alpha^1} = y_1^{\alpha^1} + iy_2^{\alpha^1}$. Gathering (29), (30) and (31) and integrating over x and y, we obtain

$$\int_{G/SU(2)\times G_s} d\Omega\frac{\det M}{f^{k_D-2}} \sim \frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}k_D-9}\pi^{k_D-4}g^{k_D-2}}{\Gamma(k_D-2)} \times \frac{1}{\epsilon^2\prod_{\alpha^1\in\Delta^1(\alpha^l)}(a, \alpha^1)^2}. \tag{32}$$

The full expression must have the similar poles for each α^l with $(a, \alpha^l) = 0$. In fact, such a function can be constructed for every simple Lie group. Let us define a holomorphic function $F_1^G(a)$ by

$$\int_{G/SU(2)\times G_s} d\Omega\frac{\det M}{f^{k_D-2}} = \frac{2^{\frac{5}{2}k_D-9}\pi^{k_D-4}g^{k_D-2}}{\Gamma(k_D-2)}F_1^G(a). \tag{33}$$

An explicit form of the function $F_1^G(a)$ is given as follows:

- Simply laced Lie groups

  All the root vectors have the same lengths. We have a general expression for these cases:

  $$F_1^G(a) = \frac{\sum_{\alpha\in\Delta_+(G)}\prod_{\alpha^0\in\Delta_+(G):(\alpha,\alpha^0)=0}(a, \alpha^0)^2\prod_{\alpha^1\in\Delta^1(\alpha)}(a, \alpha^1)(a, \alpha^1-\alpha)}{\prod_{\alpha\in\Delta_+(G)}(a, \alpha)^2}, \tag{34}$$

  where α and α^0 run over the set of positive roots $\Delta_+(G)$. The explicit expressions are also given below for the classical Lie groups A_r and D_r.

- A_r

The root vectors are described by using the orthogonal unit vectors e_i : $e_i - e_j$ $(i = 1, \cdots, r+1\,; i \neq j)$. Denoting (a, e_i) as a_i and substituting into (34), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F_1^{A_r}(a) &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{r+1} \Delta^r(a_1, \ldots, \widehat{a_r}, \ldots, a_{r+1})}{2\Delta^{r+1}(a_1, \ldots, a_{r+1})}, \\ \Delta^m(a_1, \ldots, a_m) &\equiv \prod_{k<l}^{m} (a_k - a_l)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

- B_r

The root vectors are described by $\pm e_i$, $\pm e_i \pm e_j$ $(i, j = 1, \cdots, r\,; i \neq j)$. The latter ones are the longest roots. Denoting (a, e_i) as a_i, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} F_1^{B_r}(a) &= \frac{2\sum_{i=1}^{r} Q^{r-1}(a_1, \ldots, \widehat{a_i}, \ldots, a_r)}{Q^r(a_1, \ldots, a_r)}, \\ Q^m(a_1, \ldots, a_m) &\equiv \prod_{k<l}^{m} (a_k^2 - a_l^2)^2. \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

- C_r

The root vectors are given by $\pm\sqrt{2}e_i$, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\pm e_i \pm e_j)$ $(i, j = 1, \cdots, r\,;\ i \neq j)$. The former ones are the longest. Denoting (a, e_i) as a_i, we obtain

$$F_1^{C_r}(a) = \frac{2^{r-2}}{\prod_{i=1}^{r} a_i^2}. \tag{37}$$

- D_r

The root vectors are given by $\pm e_i \pm e_j$ $(i, j = 1, \cdots, r\,; i \neq j)$. Denoting (a, e_i) as a_i, we obtain

$$F_1^{D_r}(a) = \frac{2\sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i^2 Q^{r-1}(a_1, \ldots, \widehat{a_i}, \ldots, a_r)}{Q^r(a_1, \ldots, a_r)}. \tag{38}$$

- G_2

There are 6 positive roots: $\alpha_1 = (\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}, 0)$, $\alpha_2 = (\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})$, $\alpha_3 = (-\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})$, $\beta_1 = (\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})$, $\beta_2 = (0, \sqrt{2})$, $\beta_3 = (-\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})$. The β_i's are the longest. We obtain

$$F_1^{G_2}(a) = \frac{9}{\prod_{i=1}^{3} (a, \beta_i)^2}. \tag{39}$$

- F_4

  There are 48 root vectors: $\pm e_i$, $\pm e_i \pm e_j$ $(i, j = 1, \cdots, 4\,; i \neq j)$, $\frac{1}{2}(\pm e_1 \pm e_2 \pm e_3 \pm e_4)$. The second ones are the longest roots. Denoting (a, e_i) as a_i, we obtain

  $$F_1^{F_4}(a) = \frac{2^5((a_1^2 - a_2^2)^2(a_3^2 - a_4^2)^2 + (a_1^2 - a_3^2)^2(a_2^2 - a_4^2)^2 + (a_1^2 - a_4^2)^2(a_2^2 - a_3^2)^2)}{\prod_{i<j}^4 (a_i^2 - a_j^2)^2}. \tag{40}$$

2.4 One-instanton correction to the prepotential

Substituting (33) into (23), we finally obtain the four-fermi correlation function as

$$\langle \psi_0^\dagger \psi_0^\dagger \lambda_0^\dagger \lambda_0^\dagger \rangle = -\frac{\Lambda_d^{k_D}}{g^{k_D-2}\pi^2 2^{k_D/2+6}} \frac{\Gamma(k_D+2)}{\Gamma(k_D-2)} F_1^G(a) \int d^4x_0 S_F^4. \tag{41}$$

Now we will discuss the one-instanton correction to the prepotential. Define the massless fields ϕ_i and W_i^α by

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x) &= \frac{1}{g}\phi_i(x)H^i + (\text{massive fields}), \\ W^\alpha(x) &= W_i^\alpha(x)H^i + (\text{massive fields}). \end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

In general, $N = 2$ low-energy effective action can be written of the form [1]:

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\mathrm{Im}\left[\int d^4\theta \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{F}(\phi)}{\partial \phi_i}\bar{\phi}_i\right) + \int d^2\theta \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{F}(\phi)}{\partial \phi_i \partial \phi_j} W^\alpha{}_i W_{\alpha j}\right)\right]. \tag{43}$$

Substituting (42) into (1) results in the classical part of the prepotential: $\mathcal{F}_{clas.}(\phi) = \frac{2\pi i}{g^2}\phi_i^2$. In quantum case, including one-loop and non-perturbative instanton corrections, the prepotential takes the form

$$\mathcal{F}(\phi) = \frac{\tau_0}{2}\phi_i^2 + \frac{i}{4\pi}\sum_{\alpha \in \Delta_+(G)} (\alpha, \phi)^2 \ln\frac{(\alpha, \phi)^2}{\Lambda_d^2} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{F}_n^{inst.}(\phi)\Lambda_d^{k_D n}, \tag{44}$$

where the term $\mathcal{F}_n^{inst.}(\phi)\Lambda_d^{k_D n}$ comes from the n-th instanton contribution.

Substituting $\phi_i \sim a_i + \sqrt{2}\theta\psi_i$ and $W_i \sim -i\lambda_i$ into (43), one can see that the low-energy Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_{eff}$ contains the four-fermi interaction

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \cdots + \frac{1}{2^4 \pi i}\frac{\partial^4 \mathcal{F}}{\partial a_i \partial a_j \partial a_k \partial a_l}\psi_i \psi_j \lambda_k \lambda_l + \cdots. \tag{45}$$

Since $\psi_0 = a_i\psi_i$ and $\lambda_0 = a_i\lambda_i$, the four-fermi correlation function becomes

$$\langle \psi_0^\dagger \psi_0^\dagger \lambda_0^\dagger \lambda_0^\dagger \rangle = \frac{g^8}{2^6 \pi i} a_i a_j a_k a_l \frac{\partial^4 \mathcal{F}(a)}{\partial a_i \partial a_j \partial a_k \partial a_l} \int d^4 x_0 S_F^4, \tag{46}$$

where we have performed the rotation to the euclidean space ($t \to -ix^4$). Comparing with the microscopic calculation (41), we obtain the one-instanton contribution to the prepotential as

$$\Lambda_d^{k_D} \mathcal{F}_1^{inst.}(\phi) = -\frac{i\Lambda_d^{k_D}}{\pi 2^{k_D/2}} F_1^G(\phi). \tag{47}$$

Here we have rescaled the fields as $ga \to a$, $g^2\psi_0^\dagger \to \psi_0^\dagger$, $g^2\lambda_0^\dagger \to \lambda_0^\dagger$, since the normalization of the fields are different between (2) and (43).

To compare this microscopic one-instanton result with the exact solutions, the all over normalization of the prepotential must be fixed. The classical part of the prepotential is not enough for this purpose, because the bare coupling constant is not physical. On the other hand, the all over factor of the one-loop correction to the prepotential in (44) does not depend on the bare coupling constant neither on the dynamical scale Λ_d. In the sequel, we will always normalize the prepotential by this one-loop correction.

3 Some exact results for classical gauge groups

3.1 The Picard-Fuchs equations for classical gauge groups

In this section we study the quantum moduli space of the low-energy effective theory of $N = 2$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories with classical gauge groups. The low energy effective theory for a classical Lie group G with rank r is described by $N = 2$ $U(1)^r$ vector multiplets $\phi_i = (a_i, \psi_i)$, $W_\alpha^i = (\lambda_i, v_\mu^i)$ and the prepotential $\mathcal{F}(\phi)$, a holomorphic function of $\phi_1, \ldots, \phi_r$. The quantum moduli space is then characterized by the family of hyperelliptic curves $C : y^2 = f(x; \{u_i\}, \Lambda_G)$, which is parameterized by the gauge invariant Casimir invariants $u_i = \frac{1}{i} < \mathrm{tr}\phi^i >$ and dynamically generated scale parameter Λ_G. The fields a_i and their dual fields $a_{Di} = \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}}{\partial a_i}$ belong to the sections of $Sp(2r, \mathbf{Z})$ bundle over the quantum moduli space. Their explicit form is obtained by the contour integral of the meromorphic differential λ_G on the hyperelliptic curve:

$$(\alpha_i, a_D) \;\; = \;\; \int_{B_i} \lambda_G,$$

$$(\lambda_i, a) \;=\; \int_{A_i} \lambda_G, \tag{48}$$

where (A_i, B_i) are certain homology cycles on C with the canonical intersection form $A_i \circ B_j = \delta_{ij}$, $A_i \circ A_j = B_i \circ B_j = 0$. α_i are simple roots of G and λ_i are fundamental weights of G.

The differential λ_G is determined by the condition

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_G}{\partial s_i} = -\omega_i + \frac{df_i}{dx} dx, \tag{49}$$

where s_i is certain polynomial of u_i's and ω_i are the basis of the holomorphic one-form on the curve. The quantum moduli space contains singularities on which monopoles and/or dyons become massless. When the dynamical scale Λ_G goes to zero, the effective theory becomes $N = 2$ non-abelian theory. The prepotential receives the non-perturbative instanton corrections.

The hyperelliptic curve and the meromorphic differential are known for classical gauge groups and are given as follows:
For $A_r = SU(r+1)$ $(r \geq 1)$ [23]

$$\begin{aligned} y^2 &= P_{A_r}(x)^2 - \Lambda_{A_r}^{2(r+1)}, \\ \lambda_{A_r} &= \frac{x \frac{dP_{A_r}(x)}{dx}}{y} dx, \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

where

$$P_{A_r}(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{r+1} (x - a_i) = x^{r+1} - \sum_{i=2}^{r+1} s_i x^{r+1-i}, \quad \sum_{i=1}^{r+1} a_i = 0. \tag{51}$$

For $B_r = SO(2r+1)$ $(r \geq 2)$ [24]

$$\begin{aligned} y^2 &= P_{B_r}(x)^2 - \Lambda_{B_r}^{4r-2} x^2, \\ \lambda_{B_r} &= \frac{-x \frac{dP_{B_r}(x)}{dx} + P_{B_r(x)}}{y} dx, \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

where

$$P_{B_r}(x) = P_r(x) \equiv \prod_{i=1}^{r} (x^2 - a_i^2) = x^{2r} - \sum_{i=1}^{r} s_{2i} x^{2r-2i}. \tag{53}$$

For $C_r = Sp(2r)$ $(r \geq 2)$ [29]

$$\begin{aligned} x^2 y^2 &= P_{C_r}(x)^2 - \Lambda_{C_r}^{4r+4}, \\ \lambda_{C_r} &= \frac{-\frac{dP_{C_r}(x)}{dx}}{y} dx, \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

where

$$P_{C_r}(x) = x^2 \prod_{i=1}^{r}(x^2 - a_i^2) + \Lambda_{C_r}^{2r+2} = x^2 P_r(x) + \Lambda_{C_r}^{2r+2}. \tag{55}$$

For $D_r = SO(2r)$ $(r \geq 3)$ [25]

$$\begin{aligned} y^2 &= P_{D_r}(x)^2 - \Lambda_{D_r}^{4r-4} x^4, \\ \lambda_{D_r} &= \frac{-\frac{dP_{D_r}(x)}{dx} + 2P_{D_r}(x)}{y} dx, \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where

$$P_{D_r}(x) = P_r(x), \quad s_{2r} = t^2 \tag{57}$$

and $s_2, \ldots, s_{2r-2}, t$ are the gauge invariant order parameters.

In order to examine behavior of the periods $\Pi = (a^i, a_D^i)$ near the singularities, it is useful to study the differential equation (the Picard-Fuchs equation) for the periods. The solutions for the Picard-Fuchs equation have been investigated in the case of $SU(N_c)$ $(N_c = 2, 3)$ [35], and $SU(2)$ QCD with $N_f (\leq 3)$ massless [36] and massive [38] flavors. In the following we will work on the Picard-Fuchs equations for classical gauge groups.

We begin with the A_r case, as discussed in ref. [35]. From the relation

$$\frac{\partial \lambda_{A_r}}{\partial s_i} = \frac{x^{r+1-i} dx}{y} + \frac{d}{dx}\left(\frac{x \frac{\partial P_{A_r}(x)}{\partial s_i}}{y}\right) dx, \tag{58}$$

we get

$$\frac{\partial^2 \lambda_{A_r}}{\partial s_i \partial s_j} = -\frac{x^{2r+2-i-j} dx}{y^3} + d(*). \tag{59}$$

This implies the differential equations $\mathcal{L}_{i,j;p,q}^{A_r} \Pi = 0$, where

$$\mathcal{L}_{i,j;p,q}^{A_r} = \partial_{s_i} \partial_{s_j} - \partial_{s_p} \partial_{s_q} \tag{60}$$

for $i + j = p + q$. Other types of differential equations may be obtained by considering the total derivative

$$\frac{d}{dx}\left(\frac{x^k}{y}\right) = \frac{k x^{k-1}}{y} - \frac{x^k \frac{dP_{A_r}}{dx} P_{A_r}}{y^3}. \tag{61}$$

Since

$$x^k \frac{dP_{A_r}}{dx} = (r+1) x^{r+1-k} - \sum_{j=2}^{r+1} (r+1-j) s_j x^{r+1-j}, \tag{62}$$

the r.h.s. of (61) may be expressed for $0 \leq k \leq r-2$ in terms of derivatives of λ_{A_r} up to total derivative, by using (58) and (59). Thus we may obtain a set of differential equations $\mathcal{L}_k^{A_r}\Pi = 0$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_0^{A_r} &= -(r+1)\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_r} + \sum_{j=2}^{r}(r+1-j)s_j\partial_{s_{r+1}}\partial_{s_{j+1}}, \\
\mathcal{L}_k^{A_r} &= k\partial_{s_{r+2-k}} - (r+1)\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_{r-k}} + \sum_{j=2}^{r}(r+1-j)s_j\partial_{s_{r+2-k}}\partial_{s_j}. \qquad (63)
\end{aligned}$$

For $k \geq r-1$, the r.h.s. of (61) does not give the second order differential equation with respect to s_i. However, taking certain linear combination of $d(\frac{x^{r-1}}{y}), \cdots, d(\frac{x^{2r-1}}{y})$, one gets the second order differential equation. Let us define this non-trivial equation as $\mathcal{L}_{r-1}^{A_r}\Pi = 0$. $\mathcal{L}_{r-1}^{A_r}$ is determined modulo $\mathcal{L}_k^{A_r}$ $(0 \leq k \leq r-2)$. The differential operator $\mathcal{L}_{r-1}^{A_r}$ contains the scale parameter $\Lambda_{A_r}^{2r+2}$ in contrast to other differential equations. Although we may not obtain general expressions for $\mathcal{L}_{r-1}^{A_r}$ in the present work, we give examples for A_r $(r \leq 4)$ cases, which is given as follows:

- A_1

$$\mathcal{L}_0^{A_1} = -4(\Lambda_{A_1}^4 - s_2^2)\partial_{s_2}^2 + 1. \qquad (64)$$

- A_2

$$\mathcal{L}_1^{A_2} = 4s_2^2\partial_{s_2}^2 - 9(\Lambda_{A_2}^6 - s_3^2)\partial_{s_3}^2 + 12s_2s_3\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_3} + 3s_3\partial_{s_3} + 1. \qquad (65)$$

- A_3

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_2^{A_3} &= 4(s_2^2 + 24s_4)\partial_{s_2}^2 + 9s_3^2\partial_{s_3}^2 - 16(\Lambda_{A_3}^8 - s_4^2)\partial_{s_4}^2 \\
&\quad +12s_2s_3\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_3} - 32s_2s_4\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_4} + 3s_3\partial_{s_3} - 16s_4\partial_{s_4} + 1. \qquad (66)
\end{aligned}$$

- A_4

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_3^{A_4} &= 4(s_2^2 + 20s_4)\partial_{s_2}^2 + 9s_3^2\partial_{s_3}^2 - 25(\Lambda_{A_4}^{10} - s_5^2)\partial_{s_5}^2 \\
&\quad +12s_2s_3\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_3} - 32s_2s_4\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_4} - 8s_3s_4\partial_{s_3}\partial_{s_4} + 20s_2s_5\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_5} \\
&\quad +30s_3s_5\partial_{s_3}\partial_{s_5} + 40s_4s_5\partial_{s_4}\partial_{s_5} + 3s_3\partial_{s_3} - 24s_4\partial_{s_4} + 15s_5\partial_{s_5} + 1. \qquad (67)
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that in the above results, the quantum correction appears only in the second derivative with respect to s_{r+1}. For general A_r, one expects that the Picard-Fuchs equation $\mathcal{L}^{A_r}_{r-1}$ would take the form

$$\mathcal{L}^{A_r}_{r-1} = \mathcal{L}^{A_r,classical}_{r-1} - (r+1)^2\Lambda^{2r}_{A_r}\partial^2_{s_{r+1}}, \tag{68}$$

where $\mathcal{L}^{A_r,classical}_{r-1}$ is certain differential operator which make the classical period $\oint \lambda_{A_r}|_{\Lambda=0} = \oint dx x d\log(P_{A_r}(x))$ vanish. The detailed analysis is left for future study.

Next we consider the Picard-Fuchs equations for B_r-type gauge groups. The meromorphic differential λ_{B_r} satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{s_{2i}}\lambda_{B_r} &= -\frac{x^{2r-2i}}{y}dx - \frac{d}{dx}\left(\frac{x\partial_{s_{2i}}P_r(x)}{y}\right)dx, \\
\partial_{s_{2i}}\partial_{s_{2j}}\lambda_{B_r} &= -\frac{x^{4r-i-j}P_r(x)}{y}dx + d(*).
\end{aligned} \tag{69}$$

From (69) and

$$d\left(\frac{x^{2k+1}}{y}\right) = \frac{2kx^{2k}}{y} - \frac{x^{2k+1}\frac{dP_r(x)}{dx} - x^{2k}P_r(x)}{y}P_r(x), \tag{70}$$

we obtain a set of the Picard-Fuchs equations:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}^{B_r}_{i,j;p,q}\Pi &= 0, \quad i+j=p+q, \\
\mathcal{L}^{B_r}_{i}\Pi &= 0, \quad i=0,\cdots,r-2,
\end{aligned} \tag{71}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}^{B_r}_{i,j;p,q} &= \partial_{s_{2i}}\partial_{s_{2j}} - \partial_{s_{2p}}\partial_{s_{2q}}, \\
\mathcal{L}^{B_r}_{i} &= -2i\partial_{s_{2r-2i}} + (2r-1)\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_{2r-2-2i}} - \sum_{k=1}^{r}(2r-2k-1)s_{2k}\partial_{s_{2k}}\partial_{s_{2r-2i}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

For B_r $(r \leq 4)$, the differential equation $\mathcal{L}^{B_r}_{r-1}\Pi = 0$ which includes the scale parameter takes the form

- B_2

$$\mathcal{L}^{B_2}_1 = 4s_2^2\partial^2_{s_2} - (9\Lambda^6_{B_2} - 16s_2s_4)\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_4} + 16s_4^2\partial^2_{s_4} + 8s_4\partial_{s_4} + 1. \tag{73}$$

- B_3

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_2^{B_3} &= 4(s_2^2 - 105s_4)\partial_{s_2}^2 + 100s_4^2\partial_{s_4}^2 + 36s_6^2\partial_{s_6}^2 \\
&\quad +268s_2s_4\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_4} + 24s_2s_6\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_6} - (25\Lambda_{B_3}^{10} + 36s_4s_6)\partial_{s_4}\partial_{s_6} \\
&\quad +176s_4\partial_{s_4} + 24s_6\partial_{s_6} + 1. \qquad (74)
\end{aligned}$$

- B_4

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_3^{B_4} &= 4(s_2^2 - 448s_4)\partial_{s_2}^2 + 784s_2^2\partial_{s_2}^2 + 36s_6^2\partial_{s_6}^2 + 64s_8^2\partial_{s_8}^2 + 1296s_2s_4\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_4} \\
&\quad +24s_2s_6\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_6} + 32s_2s_8\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_8} + 304s_4s_6\partial_{s_4}\partial_{s_6} - 192s_4s_8\partial_{s_4}\partial_{s_8} \\
&\quad -(49\Lambda_{B_4}^{14} - 96s_6s_8)\partial_{s_6}\partial_{s_8} + 1032s_4\partial_{s_4} + 24s_6\partial_{s_6} + 48s_8\partial_{s_8} + 1. \qquad (75)
\end{aligned}$$

In a similar way we may derive the Picard-Fuchs equations for other classical gauge groups. Here we summarize the results. For C_r type gauge group, the Picard-Fuchs equations are

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{i,j;p,q}^{C_r}\Pi &= 0, \quad i+j=p+q, \\
\mathcal{L}_i^{C_r}\Pi &= 0, \quad i=1,\ldots,r, \qquad (76)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{i,j;p,q}^{C_r} &= \partial_{s_{2i}}\partial_{s_{2j}} - \partial_{s_{2p}}\partial_{s_{2q}}, \\
\mathcal{L}_i^{C_r} &= -(2i+1)\partial_{s_{2r+2-2i}} + (2r+2)\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_{2r-2i}} - \sum_{k=1} r(2r+2-2k)s_{2k}\partial_{s_{2k}}\partial_{s_{2r+2-2i}}, \\
& \qquad (77)
\end{aligned}$$

for $i=1,\ldots,r-1$. $\mathcal{L}_r^{C_r}$ for C_r $(r=2,3,4)$ are

- C_2

$$\mathcal{L}_2^{C_2} = 4s_2^2\partial_{s_2}^2 - (144\Lambda_{C_2}^6 - 16s_2s_4)\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_4} + (72\Lambda_{C_2}^6 s_2 + 16s_4^2)\partial_{s_4}^2 + 8s_4\partial_{s_4} + 1. \qquad (78)$$

- C_3

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_3^{C_3} &= 4s_2^2\partial_{s_2}^2 + (16s_4^2 - 384\Lambda_{C_3}^8)\partial_{s_4}^2 + (36s_6^2 + 128\Lambda_{C_3}^8 s_4)\partial_{s_6}^2 \\
&\quad +16s_2s_4\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_4} + 24s_2s_6\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_6} + (256\Lambda_{C_3}^8 s_2 + 48s_4s_6)\partial_{s_4}\partial_{s_6} \\
&\quad +8s_4\partial_{s_4} + 24s_6\partial_{s_6} + 1. \qquad (79)
\end{aligned}$$

- C_4

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_4^{C_4} &= 4s_2^2\partial_{s_2}^2+16s_4^2\partial_{s_4}^2+36s_6^2\partial_{s_6}^2+(200s_6\Lambda_{C_4}^{10}+64s_8^2)\partial_{s_8}^2+16s_2s_4\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_4}\\ &+24s_2s_6\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_6}+(-800\Lambda_{C_4}^{10}+32s_2s_8)\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_8}+48s_4s_6\partial_{s_4}\partial_{s_6}\\ &+(600s_2\Lambda_{C_4}^{10}+64s_4s_8)\partial_{s_4}\partial_{s_8}+(400s_4\Lambda_{C_4}^{10}+64s_6s_8)\partial_{s_6}\partial_{s_8}\\ &+8s_4\partial_{s_4}+24s_6\partial_{s_6}+48s_8\partial_{s_8}+1.\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

For D_r $(r \geq 3)$, the Picard-Fuchs equations read

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{i,j;p,q}^{D_r}\Pi &= 0, \quad i+j=p+q\\ \mathcal{L}_i^{D_r}\Pi &= 0, \quad i=0,\ldots,r-1\end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{i,j;p,q}^{D_r} &= \partial_{s_{2i}}\partial_{s_{2j}}-\partial_{s_{2p}}\partial_{s_{2q}},\\ \mathcal{L}_i^{D_r} &= -(2i-1)\partial_{s_{2r-2i}}+(2r-2)\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_{2r-2-2i}}-\sum_{k=1} r(2r-2-2k)s_{2k}\partial_{s_{2k}}\partial_{s_{2r-2i}},\end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

for $i=0,\ldots,r-2$. The remaining differential operator $\mathcal{L}_{r-1}^{D_r}$ for D_r $(r=3,4)$ take the form

- D_3

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_2^{D_3} &= (4s_2^2-96s_4)\partial_{s_2}^2+16s_4^2\partial_{s_4}^2+(64s_2s_4-72s_6)\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_4}\\ &+(-16\Lambda_{D_3}^8+60s_2s_6)\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_6}+32s_4\partial_{s_4}+6s_6\partial_{s_6}+1.\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

- D_4

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_3^{D_4} &= 4(s_2^2-96s_4)\partial_{s_2}^2+144s_4^2\partial_{s_4}^2-36(\Lambda_{D_4}^{12}-s_6^2)\partial_{s_6}^2+64s_8^2\partial_{s_8}^2+272s_2s_4\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_4}\\ &+24s_2s_6\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_6}+32s_2s_8\partial_{s_2}\partial_{s_8}+46s_4s_6\partial_{s_4}\partial_{s_6}-64s_4s_8\partial_{s_4}\partial_{s_8}+96s_6s_8\partial_{s_6}\partial_{s_8}\\ &+200s_4\partial_{s_4}+24s_6\partial_{s_6}+48s_8\partial_{s_8}+1.\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

So far we have written down the differential operators for classical gauge groups with rank $r \leq 4$. We now check the consistency of the above Picard-Fuchs equations. Since $B_2 = C_2$

and $A_3 = D_3$, the differential equations should be equivalent though the curves look like different. For B_2 and C_2, one needs to change the basis of root system

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_1 + \hat{a}_2), \\ a_2 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_1 - \hat{a}_2), \end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

where a_i and $\hat{a}_i$ are the Higgs field in C_2 and B_2 curves, respectively. This implies the change of variables

$$\begin{aligned} s_2 &= \hat{s}_2, \\ s_4 &= -\hat{s}_4 - \frac{1}{4}\hat{s}_2^2. \end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

One can check the Picard-Fuchs equations for B_2 and C_2 are equivalent if the scale parameters have a relation

$$\Lambda_{B_2}^6 = -16\Lambda_{C_2}^6. \tag{87}$$

For A_3 and D_3, we find that both differential equations are equivalent if the relations

$$\begin{aligned} s_6 &= -\frac{1}{8}\hat{s}_3^2, \\ s_4 &= -\hat{s}_4 - \frac{1}{4}\hat{s}_2^2, \\ s_2 &= -\hat{s}_2, \\ \Lambda_{D_3} &= \Lambda_{A_3} \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

hold. Here s_{2i}'s and $\hat{s}_j$'s are order parameters in D_3 and A_3 curves respectively.

3.2 Solutions of the Picard-Fuchs equations in the semi-classical regime

In this subsection we study the solutions of the Picard-Fuchs equations in the semi-classical regime ($\Lambda \sim 0$) and compute the one-instanton contributions to the prepotentials. Firstly we consider the rank two case. Since the $SU(3)$ Picard-Fuchs equations are studied in ref. [35] using Apell's generalized hypergeometric functions, we consider the B_2 case. As in the case of $N = 2$ $SU(3)$ massless SQCD [37], the B_2 Picard-Fuchs equations may not be written in the form of Apell's type. Let us rewrite the equations by using Euler derivatives $\vartheta_{2i} = s_{2i}\partial_{s_{2i}}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_0 &= 3s_2^{-2}(\vartheta_2^2 - \vartheta_2) + s_4^{-1}\vartheta_4(\vartheta_4 - 1 - \vartheta_2), \\ \mathcal{L}_1 &= (2\vartheta_2 + 4\vartheta_4 - 1)^2 - \frac{9\Lambda_{B_2}^6}{s_2 s_4}\vartheta_2\vartheta_4. \end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

It is natural to introduce new variables

$$x_1 = \frac{s_4}{s_2^2}, \quad x_2 = \frac{\Lambda_{B_2}^6}{s_2 s_4}. \tag{90}$$

We construct the power series solution of (89) around $(x_1, x_2) = (0, 0)$. Let

$$w(a, b; x_1, x_2) = \sum_{m,n \geq 0} c_{m,n} x_1^{m+a} x_2^{n+b} = s_2^{\alpha} s_4^{\beta} + \cdots, \tag{91}$$

be a formal power series of x_1 and x_2 with $c_{0,0} = 1$. Here $\alpha = -2a - b$ and $\beta = a - b$. The indicial equations of (89) read

$$\beta(\beta - 1 - \alpha) = 0, \quad (2\alpha + 4\beta - 1)^2 = 0. \tag{92}$$

These equations have two roots of multiplicity 2. They are $(a, b) = (-1/6, -1/6)$, $(1/3, -1/6)$. From (89), $c_{m,n}$ obeys the recursion relations:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{m,n} &= \frac{-3(m - 1 - n + a - b)(m - n + a - b - 2)}{(m - n + a - b)(-(m + a) - 1 - 2(n + b))} c_{m-1,n}, \\ c_{m,n} &= \frac{-9(m - n + a - b + 1)(2(m + a) + (n - 1 + b))}{(6(n + b) + 1)^2} c_{m,n-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{93}$$

Thus we get two power series solutions $w_1(s_2, s_4) = w(-1/6, -1/6, x_1, x_2)$, $w_2(s_2, s_4) = w(1/3, -1/6; x_1, x_2)$. Two periods $a_1(s_2, s_4)$ and $a_2(s_2, s_4)$ are expressed in terms of linear combinations of w_1 and w_2. In the limit $\Lambda_{B_2} \to 0$, a_i goes to ϕ_i, where ϕ_i is the solutions of

$$(x^2 - a_1^2)(x^2 - a_2^2) = x^4 - s_2 x^2 - s_4 = 0. \tag{94}$$

This classical limit determines a_i. We find that

$$a_1(s_2, s_4) = w_1(s_2, s_4), \quad a_2(s_2, s_4) = i w_2(s_2, s_4). \tag{95}$$

We may obtain the logarithmic type solutions w_{D1}, w_{D2} by the Frobenius method:

$$\begin{aligned} w_{D1}(s_1,s_2) &= -3(\log s_2)w_1(s_1,s_2) - \frac{s_4}{s_2^{3/2}} + \frac{3}{8}\Lambda_{B_2}^6 \frac{1}{s_2^{5/2}} - \frac{2}{3}\Lambda_{B_2}^6 \frac{s_4^{1/2}}{s_2^{7/2}} + \cdots, \\ w_{D2}(s_2,s_4) &= -\log(s_2 s_4)w_2(s_2,s_4) - \frac{5}{3}\frac{s_4^{3/2}}{s_2^{5/2}} + \frac{1}{8}\Lambda_{B_2}^6 \frac{1}{s_2^{3/2}s_4^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{2}\Lambda_{B_2}^6 \frac{s_4^{1/2}}{s_2^{7/2}} + \cdots . \end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

The dual fields a_D^1 and a_D^2 are expressed as $a_D^1 = -w_{D1} + a_{11}w_1 + a_{12}w_2$ and $a_D^1 = -iw_{D2} + a_{21}w_1 + a_{22}w_2$, where a_{ij} are constants. These constants are determined by evaluating the period integral. For the computation of the instanton correction to the prepotential, however, explicit form of a_D^i is not necessary. Actually the prepotential $\mathcal{F}(a)$ satisfies the scaling equation [51]

$$8\pi i b_1 s_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{r} a_i \frac{\partial \mathcal{F}(a)}{a_i} - 2\mathcal{F}(a), \tag{97}$$

where b_1 is the coefficient of the 1-loop beta function $b_1 = k_D/16\pi^2$. In the semi-classical regime, the exact prepotential $\mathcal{F}(a)$ has an expansion

$$\mathcal{F}(a) = \frac{\tau_0'}{2}a^2 + \frac{i}{4\pi}\sum_{\alpha\in\Delta_+(G)}(\alpha,a)^2 \ln\frac{(\alpha,a)^2}{\Lambda_d^2} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\mathcal{F}_n(a)\Lambda_G^{k_D n}. \tag{98}$$

Therefore, to calculate the one-instanton correction term $\mathcal{F}_1$, we need to know only explicit form of a_i. In the B_2 case, by inserting (95) into (97), we find that

$$\Lambda_{B_2}^6 \mathcal{F}_1(a) = -\frac{i}{4\pi}\frac{\Lambda_{B_2}^6}{8}\frac{2}{(a_1^2-a_2^2)^2}. \tag{99}$$

In a similar way, one may perform exact calculation of the instanton calculation to the prepotentials for other gauge groups. In the present work, we have performed the explicit calculation up to rank 3 cases. But as in the case of A_r, the matching condition for the scale parameter by making one of the vacuum expectation values of the Higgs fields large and the Weyl group symmetry will determine $\mathcal{F}_1$ explicitly, which will be discussed in the next section.

We next study the rank 3 case. Since A_3 and C_3 cases may be treated in a similar way, we discuss the B_3 case in some detail. Using the Euler derivatives, the differential equations read

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = -5s_2^{-1}s_4^{-1}\vartheta_2\vartheta_4 + s_6^{-1}\vartheta_6(3\vartheta_2 + \vartheta_4 - \vartheta_6 + 1),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_1 &= -s_4^{-1}\vartheta_4(3\vartheta_2+\vartheta_4-\vartheta_6+1)+5s_2^{-2}\vartheta_2(\vartheta_2-1), \\
\mathcal{L}_2 &= 4\vartheta_2^2-4\vartheta_2+268\vartheta_2\vartheta_4+100\vartheta_4^2+76\vartheta_4+24\vartheta_2\vartheta_6-39\vartheta_4\vartheta_6+36\vartheta_6^2-12\vartheta_6+1 \\
&\quad -420\frac{s_4}{s_2^2}\vartheta_2(\vartheta_2-1)-25\frac{\Lambda_{B_3}^{10}}{s_4 s_6}\vartheta_4\vartheta_6. \qquad (100)
\end{aligned}$$

We introduce new variables x_1, x_2, x_3:

$$x_1=\frac{s_6}{s_2 s_4}, \quad x_2=\frac{s_4}{s_2^2}, \quad x_3=\frac{\Lambda_{B_3}^{10}}{s_4 s_6} \qquad (101)$$

and construct power series solutions around $(x_1,x_2,x_3)=(0,0,0)$ of the form

$$w(a,b,c;x_1,x_2,x_3)=\sum_{l,m,n\geq 0} d_{l,m,n}x_1^{l+a}x_2^{m+b}x_3^{n+c}=s_2^{\alpha}s_4^{\beta}s_6^{\gamma}+\cdots, \qquad (102)$$

where $\alpha=-a-2b$, $\beta=-a+b-c$ and $\gamma=a-b$ and $d_{0,0,0}=1$. The indicial equations become

$$\begin{aligned}
&\gamma(3\alpha+\beta-\gamma+1)=0, \\
&\beta(3\alpha+\beta-\gamma+1)=0, \\
&4\alpha^2-4\alpha+268\alpha\beta+100\beta^2+76\beta+24\alpha\gamma-36\beta\gamma+36\gamma^2-12\gamma+1=0, \qquad (103)
\end{aligned}$$

which have solutions $(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)=(1/2,0,0),(-1/2,1/2,0),(-1/4-\beta/2,\beta,1/4-\beta/2)$. $d_{l,m.n}$ obey the recursion relations:

$$\begin{aligned}
d_{l,m,n} &= \frac{5\tilde{l}(l-1,m,n)\tilde{m}(l-1,m,n)}{\tilde{n}(l,m,n)(3\tilde{l}(l,m,n)+\tilde{m}(l,m,n)-\tilde{n}(l,m,n)+1)}d_{l-1,m.n}, \\
d_{l,m,n} &= \frac{5\tilde{m}(l,m-1,n)(\tilde{m}(l,m-1,n)-1)}{\tilde{m}(l,m,n)(3\tilde{l}(l,m,n)+\tilde{m}(l,m,n)-\tilde{n}(l,m,n)+1)}d_{l,m-1,n}, \\
d_{l,m,n} &= \frac{420\tilde{l}(l,m-1,n)(\tilde{l}(l,m-1,n)-1)}{A(l,m.n)}d_{l,m-1,n}+\frac{25\tilde{m}(l,m,n-1)\tilde{n}(l,m,n-1)}{A(l,m,n)}d_{l,m,n-1}, \\
&\qquad (104)
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{l}(l,m,n)=-(l+a)-2(m+b)$, $\tilde{m}(l,m,n)=-(l+a)+(m+b)-(n+c)$, $\tilde{m}(l,m,n)=(l+a)-(n+c)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
A(l,m,n) &= 4\tilde{l}(l,m,n)^2-4\tilde{l}(l,m,n)+268\tilde{l}(l,m,n)\tilde{m}(l,m,n)+100\tilde{m}(l,m,n)^2 \\
&\quad +76\tilde{m}(l,m,n)+24\tilde{l}(l,m,n)\tilde{n}(l,m,n)-36\tilde{m}(l,m,n)\tilde{n}(l,m,n) \\
&\quad +36\tilde{n}(l,m,n)^2-12\tilde{n}(l,m,n)+1. \qquad (105)
\end{aligned}$$

In order to determine (a,b,c), we need to consider the classical limit $(\Lambda \to 0)$. In this limit $\pm a_i$ are the solution of $x^6 - s_2x^4 - s_4x^2 - s_6 = 0$. We thus find that the quantum a_i becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1(s_2,s_4,s_6) &= w(\frac{-1}{10},\frac{-1}{5},\frac{-1}{10};s_2,s_4,s_6),\\
a_2(s_2,s_4,s_6) &= \frac{1+i}{\sqrt{2}}w(\frac{3}{20},\frac{1}{20},\frac{-1}{10};s_2,s_4,s_6)+\frac{\sqrt{2}(i-1)}{8}w(\frac{-7}{20},\frac{11}{20},\frac{-1}{10};s_2,s_4,s_6),\\
a_3(s_2,s_4,s_6) &= \frac{1-i}{\sqrt{2}}w(\frac{3}{20},\frac{1}{20},\frac{-1}{10};s_2,s_4,s_6)+\frac{\sqrt{2}(-i-1)}{8}w(\frac{-7}{20},\frac{11}{20},\frac{-1}{10};s_2,s_4,s_6).
\end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

Using (97), we find that one-instanton correction to the prepotential is

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = -\frac{i}{4\pi}\frac{1}{8}\left(\frac{1}{(a_1^2-a_2^2)^2(a_1^2-a_3^2)^2}+\frac{1}{(a_1^2-a_2^2)^2(a_2^2-a_3^2)^2}+\frac{1}{(a_1^2-a_3^2)^2(a_2^2-a_3^2)^2}\right). \tag{107}$$

For C_r type gauge groups, the results are as follows:

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \begin{cases} \frac{i}{4\pi}\frac{1}{a_1^2a_2^2} & \text{for } C_2,\\ \frac{i}{4\pi}\frac{1}{a_1^2a_2^2a_3^2} & \text{for } C_3. \end{cases} \tag{108}$$

For A_3, we have the same result as in ref. [16], which is expected from the matching condition of the scale parameter.

4 Matching conditions for scale parameters

In this section, we will discuss the relations between the scale parameters in the microscopic theories and those in the exact solutions for the classical gauge groups, and then will compare the one-instanton corrections to the prepotentials. To do so, we will first discuss the matching conditions of the scale parameters, and then will use the known relation in $N=2$ $SU(2)$ SYM theory [14, 16].

When the gauge group is broken down from G to G' by the Higgs mechanism, the matching condition of effective gauge couplings in the Pauli-Villas regularization scheme leads to the condition between the dynamical scales [14]:

$$\Lambda_{d,G}^{k_D} = \prod_i m_i \Lambda_{d,G'}^{k'_D}, \tag{109}$$

where m_i's denote the masses of the gauge bosons which become massive by the Higgs scalar vacuum expectation values.

Firstly we consider the case $A_r \longrightarrow A_{r-1}$. The root vectors of A_r are given as in section 2.3. The reduction can be realized by considering a vacuum expectation value

$$a = b\sum_{i=1}^{r} e_i - rbe_{r+1} + \hat{a}, \quad (\hat{a}, e_{r+1}) = (\hat{a}, \sum_{i=1}^{r} e_i) = 0, \tag{110}$$

where $b \gg \hat{a}$. The massive gauge bosons are related to the roots $e_i - e_{r+1}$ $(i = 1, \cdots, r)$, and their mass is given by $\sqrt{2}(a, e_i - e_{r+1}) \sim \sqrt{2}(1+r)b$. Hence the matching condition is given by

$$\Lambda_{d,A_r}^{2(r+1)} = 2(1+r)^2 b^2 \Lambda_{d,A_{r-1}}^{2r}. \tag{111}$$

One can see easily that the one-instanton correction (35), (47) is consistent with the matching condition (111). On the other hand, the matching condition in the exact solution can be derived from the hyperelliptic curve most easily. Substituting

$$a_i = (a, e_i) = b + \hat{a}_i \ (i = 1, \cdots, r), \quad a_{r+1} = (a, e_{r+1}) = -rb \tag{112}$$

into (50), (51), one obtains the matching condition

$$\Lambda_{A_r}^{2(r+1)} = (1+r)^2 b^2 \Lambda_{A_{r-1}}^{2r}, \tag{113}$$

after a rescaling and a shift of y and x. Since $\Lambda_{d,A_1} = \Lambda_{A_1}$ in the Pauli-Villas regularization scheme [14, 16], we obtain the relation between the scales as [16]

$$\Lambda_{d,A_r} = 2^{r-1}\Lambda_{A_r}. \tag{114}$$

The same procedure works for cases $B_r \longrightarrow B_{r-1}$, $C_r \longrightarrow C_{r-1}$ and $D_r \longrightarrow D_{r-1}$, if one considers the scalar vacuum expectation value (see section 2.3)

$$a = be_1 + \hat{a}, \quad (\hat{a}, e_1) = 0. \tag{115}$$

But a little care must be taken for the case $C_r \longrightarrow C_{r-1}$. This is because there are two kinds of massive gauge bosons with different masses. They are related to the roots $\sqrt{2}e_1$ and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(e_i \pm e_1)$ $(i = 2, \cdots, r)$, respectively. Only the latter appears in the one-loop diagram of the renormalization of the gauge coupling of C_{r-1}. Hence the mass to be taken is b. We will give a list of the matching condition in the following.

- $B_r \longrightarrow B_{r-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{d,B_r}^{4r-2} &= 4b^4\Lambda_{d,B_{r-1}}^{4r-6}, \\ \Lambda_{B_r}^{4r-2} &= b^4\Lambda_{B_{r-1}}^{4r-6}. \end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

- $C_r \longrightarrow C_{r-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{d,C_r}^{2r+2} &= b^2\Lambda_{d,C_{r-1}}^{2r}, \\ \Lambda_{C_r}^{2r+2} &= b^2\Lambda_{C_{r-1}}^{2r}. \end{aligned} \tag{117}$$

- $D_r \longrightarrow D_{r-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{d,D_r}^{4r-4} &= 4b^4\Lambda_{d,D_{r-1}}^{4r-8}, \\ \Lambda_{D_r}^{4r-4} &= b^4\Lambda_{D_{r-1}}^{4r-8}. \end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

All of the above relations for the dynamical scales Λ_d are consistent with the microscopic instanton calculations (36), (37), (38) and (47).

Now let us discuss the Higgs breakings $B_r \rightarrow A_{r-1}$ and $D_r \rightarrow A_{r-1}$. Both of them can be realized by

$$a = b\sum_{i=1}^{r} e_i + \hat{a}, \quad (\hat{a}, \sum_{i=1}^{r} e_i) = 0. \tag{119}$$

Similar discussions as above show that

- $B_r \longrightarrow A_{r-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{d,B_r}^{4r-2} &= 2^{3r-5}b^{2r-2}\Lambda_{d,A_{r-1}}^{2r}, \\ \Lambda_{B_r}^{4r-2} &= 4^r b^{2r-2}\Lambda_{A_{r-1}}^{2r}, \end{aligned} \tag{120}$$

  and

- $D_r \longrightarrow A_{r-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{d,D_r}^{4r-4} &= 2^{3r-6}b^{2r-4}\Lambda_{d,A_{r-1}}^{2r}, \\ \Lambda_{D_r}^{4r-4} &= 2^{2r}b^{2r-4}\Lambda_{A_{r-1}}^{2r}. \end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

Concerning C_r, we have the relation (87) as well as $\Lambda_{d,C_2} = \Lambda_{d,B_2}$, which should be trivially satisfied in the microscopic theory. The relations in this subsection consistently fix the relations between Λ_d and Λ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{d,B_r}^{4r-2} &= 2^{2r-7}\Lambda_{B_r}^{4r-2}, \\
\Lambda_{d,C_r}^{2r+2} &= -2\Lambda_{C_r}^{2r+2}, \\
\Lambda_{d,D_r}^{4r-4} &= 2^{2r-8}\Lambda_{D_r}^{4r-4}. \qquad (122)
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (122) into the results of the microscopic one-instanton calculations (36), (37) and (47), we find they agree with the exact solutions (99), (107) for $B_{2,3}$ and (108) for $C_{2,3}$ on the numerical factors as well as on the functional forms.

5 Conclusions and discussions

In this paper, we have calculated the one-instanton correction to the prepotential in the $N = 2$ SYM theory with any simple gauge group by the microscopic instanton calculation, and have found the microscopic one-instanton corrections agree with those from the exact solutions for some classical gauge groups. To derive the instanton corrections from the exact solutions, we have derived the Picard-Fuchs equations from the proposed hyperelliptic curves and meromorphic differentials, and solve them to the one-instanton level near semi-classical regime.

The generalization to $N = 2$ SQCD with fundamental hypermultiplets would be straightforward. In $N = 2$ $SU(2)$ SQCD with fundamental hypermultiplets, the lowest instanton correction is the two-instanton effect [4]. This is due to the Z_2 symmetry originating from the fact that the representation of $SU(2)$ is psudoreal. For the other gauge groups, one naturally expects the lowest instanton correction will be the one-instanton contribution. Hence it would be interesting to investigate the comparison in $N = 2$ SQCD with the other gauge groups, especially for the similar cases that some discrepancies have been reported [21, 22]. These cases would be generalized to $N = 2$ $SU(N_c)$ SQCD with N_f ($2N_c - 2 \leq N_f \leq 2N_c$) fundamental hypermultiplets. In these cases, the result of the group integration would have a regular term, which can not be determined solely by the estimation of the poles. Thus one will have to improve the method in this direction.

The investigation of the exceptional Lie groups would be also interesting. We have already calculated the one-instanton correction to the prepotential by the microscopic one-instanton calculation. Hence only the comparison with the exact solutions is necessary. The explicit forms of the hyperelliptic curves for the G_2 [32], F_4 and $E_{6,7,8}$ [33, 52, 53] SYM theories have been already proposed. The new feature of the F_4 and $E_{6,7,8}$ cases is that there are too many homology cycles on the hyperelliptic curves compared to the number of the rank of the gauge groups. The comparison would be an interesting non-trivial test for the validity of the proposed curves.

Acknowledgments

N.S. would like to thank K. Higashijima, H. Kanno, H. Kunitomo, T. Nakatsu and M. Sato for valuable discussions. N.S. is supported by JSPS Research Fellowship for Young Scientists (No. 06-3758). The work of K.I. is supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Ministry of Education (No. 08740188 and No. 08211209).

Appendix A Conventions on the Cartan-Weyl basis

We use the following conventions on the Cartan-Weyl basis of the Lie algebra g of a simple Lie group G.

$$\begin{aligned}
[H_i, E_\alpha] &= \alpha_i E_\alpha, \\
[E_\alpha, E_{-\alpha}] &= \sum_{i=1}^{r} \alpha_i H_i, \\
\mathrm{Tr}_{adj}(H_i H_j) &= k_D \delta_{ij}, \\
\mathrm{Tr}_{adj}(E_\alpha E_{-\alpha'}) &= k_D \delta_{\alpha\alpha'},
\end{aligned}$$

where r is the rank of the Lie algebra g, α_i is a root vector, and k_D denotes the Dynkin index of the adjoint representation. The trace is taken in the adjoint representation. The longest roots α^l are normalized by $(\alpha^l, \alpha^l) = 2$.

Appendix B The Dynkin indices of the adjoint representation

For completeness, we give here a list of Dynkin indices of the adjoint representations of simple Lie algebras [54].

$$\begin{array}{lll} {k_D}^{A_r} = 2(r+1), & {k_D}^{B_r} = 2(2r-1), & {k_D}^{C_r} = 2(r+1), \\ {k_D}^{D_r} = 4(r-1), & {k_D}^{G_2} = 8, & {k_D}^{F_4} = 18, \\ {k_D}^{E_6} = 24, & {k_D}^{E_7} = 36, & {k_D}^{E_8} = 60. \end{array}$$

References

[1] N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. **B206** (1988) 75.

[2] S.J. Gates, Jr., Nucl. Phys. **B238** (1984) 349;
B. de Wit and A. Van Proyen, Nucl. Phys. **B245** (1984) 89.

[3] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B426** (1994) 19.

[4] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B431** (1994) 484.

[5] I. Affleck, M. Dine and N. Seiberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51** (1983) 1026.

[6] I. Affleck, M. Dine and N. Seiberg, Nucl. Phys. **B241** (1984) 493.

[7] V.A. Novikov, M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B229** (1983) 394.

[8] V.A. Novikov, M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, Nucl. Phys. **B260** (1985) 157.

[9] G.C. Rossi and G. Veneziano, Phys. Lett. **B138** (1984) 195.

[10] D. Amati, K. Konishi, Y. Meurice, G.C. Rossi and G. Veneziano, Phys. Rep. **162** (1988) 169.

[11] A. D'Adda and P.Di Vecchia, Phys. Lett. **73B** (1978) 162.

[12] M.A. Shifman and A.I. Vainshtein, Nucl. Phys. **B359** (1991) 571.

[13] N. Seiberg, Phys. Lett. **B318** (1993) 469.

[14] D. Finnell and P. Pouliot, Nucl. Phys. **B453** (1995) 225.

[15] A. Yung, *Instanton Induced Effective Lagrangian in the Seiberg-Witten Model*, hep-th/9605096.

[16] K. Ito and N. Sasakura, Phys. Lett. **B382** (1996) 95.

[17] N. Dorey, V.V. Khoze and M.P. Mattis, *Multi - Instanton Calculus in N=2 Supersymmetric Gauge Theory*, hep-th/9603136.

[18] F. Fucito and G. Travaglini, *Instanton Calculus and Nonperturbative Relations in N=2 Supersymmetric Gauge Theories*, hep-th/9605215.

[19] N. Dorey, V.V. Khoze and M.P. Mattis, *Multi - Instanton Check of the Relation between the Prepotential F and the Modulus u in N=2 SUSY Yang-Mills Theory*, hep-th/9606199.

[20] N. Dorey, V.V. Khoze and M.P. Mattis, *A Two Instanton Test of the Exact Solution of N=2 Supersymmetric QCD*, hep-th/9607066.

[21] H. Aoyama, T. Harano, M. Sato and S. Wada, *Multiinstanton Calculus in N=2 Supersymmetric QCD*, hep-th/9607076.

[22] N. Dorey, V.V. Khoze and M.P. Mattis, *Multiinstanton Calculus in N=2 Supersymmetric Gauge Theory 2*, hep-th/9607202.

[23] A. Klemm, W. Lerche, S. Theisen and S. Yankielowicz, Phys. Lett. **B344** (1995) 169; P.C. Argyres and A.E. Faraggi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74** (1995) 3931.

[24] U.H. Danielsson and B. Sundborg, Phys. Lett. **B358** (1995) 273.

[25] A. Brandhuber and K. Landsteiner, Phys. Lett. **B358** (1995) 73.

[26] A. Hanany and Y. Oz, Nucl. Phys. **B452** (1995) 283.

[27] P.C. Argyres, M.R. Plesser and A.D. Shapere, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 1699.

[28] J.A. Minahan and D. Nemeschansky, Nucl. Phys. **B464** (1996) 3.

[29] P.C. Argyres and A.D. Shapere, Nucl. Phys. **B461** (1996) 437.

[30] A. Hanany, Nucl. Phys. **B466** (1996) 85.

[31] U.H. Danielsson and B. Sundborg, Phys. Lett. **B370** (1996) 83.

[32] M. Alishahiha, F. Ardalan and F. Mansouri, *The Moduli Space of the* $N = 2$ *Supersymmetric* G_2 *Yang-Mills Theory*, hep-th/9512005.

[33] M.R. Abolhasani, M. Alishahiha and A.M. Ghezelbash, *The Moduli Space and Monodromies of the N=2 Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory with any Lie Gauge Groups*, hep-th/9606043.

[34] A. Ceresole, R. D'Auria and S. Ferrara, Phys. Lett. **B339** (1994) 71.

[35] A. Klemm, W. Lerche and S. Theisen, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 11** (1996) 1929.

[36] K. Ito and S.-K. Yang, Phys. Lett. **B366** (1996) 165.

[37] K. Ito and S.-K. Yang, *Picard-Fuchs Equations and Prepotentials in* $N = 2$ *Supersymmetric QCD* , hep-th/9603073.

[38] Y. Ohta, *Prepotentials of* $N = 2$ $SU(2)$ *Yang-Mills gauge theory coupled with a massive matter multiplet*, hep-th/9604051;
Prepotentials of $N = 2$ $SU(2)$ *Yang-Mills theories coupled with massive matter multiplets*, hep-th/9604059.

[39] C.W. Bernard, Phys. Rev. **D19** (1979) 3013.

[40] S.F. Cordes, Nucl. Phys. **B273** (1986) 629.

[41] J. Fuchs, Nucl. Phys. **B282** (1987) 437.

[42] I. Affleck, Nucl. Phys. **B191** (1981) 429.

[43] J. Wess and J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, Princeton University Press, 1992.

[44] A.A. Belavin, A.M. Polyakov, A.S. Schwartz and Y.S. Tyupkin, Phys. Lett. **59B** (1975) 85.

[45] M.F. Atiyah, N.J. Hitchin, V.G. Drinfeld and Yu.I. Manin, Phys. Lett. **65A** (1978) 185.

[46] A. Vainshtein, V. Zakharov, V. Novikov and M. Shifman, Sov. Phys. Usp. **25** (1982) 195.

[47] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. **D14** (1976) 3432.

[48] C.W. Bernard, N.H. Christ, A.H. Guth and E.J. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D16** (1977) 2967.

[49] M. Atiyah and I. Singer, Ann. Math. **87** (1968) 484; **93** (1971) 119.

[50] M.A. Shifman and A.I. Vainshtein, Nucl. Phys. **B362** (1991) 21.

[51] M. Matone, Phys. Lett. **B357** (1995) 342;
J. Sonnenschein, S. Theisen and S. Yankielowicz, Phys. Lett. **B367** (1996) 145;
T. Eguchi and S.-K. Yang, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A11** (1996) 131.

[52] E. Martinec and N. Warner, Nucl. Phys. **B459** (1996) 97.

[53] T. Eguchi and K. Hori, $N = 2$ *Superconformal Field Theories in 4 Dimensions and* $A - D - E$ *Classification*, hep-th/9607125.

[54] See for example, R. Slansky, Phys. Rep. **79** (1981).